UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,229	11/30/2001	Yakov Kamen	007287.00015	6955

22907   7590   03/02/2010
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1100 13th STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

EXAMINER
RAMAN, USHA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2424	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/02/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 December 2009</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-17 and 19-21</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-17 and 19-21</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed December 1, 2009 have been fully considered but they
are not persuasive.

Applicant argues (see Remarks, page 8) that, "Maintaining a list of favorites
based on relative statistics clearly does not constitute adding a first category from
the first set of categories of broadcast programs in response to tuning a broadcast
program viewing device to a broadcasted program fitting into the first category of the
first set of categories a predetermined number of times. At most, Candelore
describes adding a category to the list of favorites based on the amount of time or
number of times it was viewed relative to other programs".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The EPG of the modified system meets
the first set of categories, wherein examiner contends that maintaining relative
statistics is an intermediary step to creating a list of favorites from that EPG data
[0023], wherein favorite items maybe channels, programs, actors, themes, etc. Put
another EPG attributes are the first set of categories [0045]. By maintaining the
relative statistics, the system is able to have a memory of how frequently a
program/category is tuned and determine what the most tuned to programs are. The
most tuned to programs are in turn compiled into a list of favorites (i.e. second set of
categories). Accordingly an EPG category makes an entry into a favorites list in
response to tuning a broadcast program viewing device to a broadcast program
fitting into a category a predetermined number of times.

Applicant further argues (see Remarks, page 8) that, "the addition of Bedard

fails to cure the deficiencies of Candelore" stating (see Remarks, page 8) that,

"Bedard describes adding a category to a viewer profile based on a number of times

a channel associated with that category has been viewed" and (see Remarks, page

8) that, "There is no teaching or suggestion in Bedard of adding a category to a set

of categories based in response to tuning a device to a program fitting into the first

category". Applicant appears to be arguing the Bedard in isolation without

considering combination of Candelore and Bedard. Applicant must bear in mind

that, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where

the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642

F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231

USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In particular, it should be noted that Candelore

discloses that a tuning event can be based on a channel or a program [0032].

Candelore further discloses maintaining count on statistics that is based on viewing

unit, wherein such a viewing unit can indicate the number of times something was

viewed or the amount of time spent viewing something [0045]. Bedard is particularly

relied upon for the teaching of adding an entry to a favorites list only when the

viewing unit is greater than 1, wherein as noted before, Candelore discloses such a

viewing unit can be an indication of the number of times tuned. Accordingly the

modified system discloses the step of "wherein the predetermined number of times

is greater than 1".

Applicant argues (see Remarks, page 9) that, "at most Blonstein describes removing a channel from a favorites list...there is no teaching or suggestion of removing a category". Examiner respectfully disagrees. As noted previously, Candelore discloses maintaining statistics from which favorites are determined, wherein favorite items maybe channels, programs, actors, themes, etc. [0045]. Blonstein further discloses removing an item from the favorites list, wherein in the modified system such a list may comprise variety of item types. Applicant's arguments made on Remarks, page 12 are found unpersuasive for similar reasons.

Applicant argues (see Remarks, page 10) that, "At most Rothmuller describes removing a program title from a favorite program list....there is absolutely no teaching or suggestion of removing any category not being tuned for a period of time at least equal to a first predetermined threshold". As noted previously, Candelore discloses maintaining statistics from which favorites are determined, wherein favorite items maybe channels, programs, actors, themes, etc. [0045]. Rothmuller further of tracking the time stamp a program is selected in the favorites list (col. 5, lines 62-65). A program is removed from the favorites list, when its time stamp exceeds a predetermined time (col. 6, lines 51-54), meaning that it has not been tuned to for that predetermined time (otherwise the time stamp would be updated and be less than the predetermined time). Accordingly Rothmuller discloses removing an item from favorites list based on the viewing device note being tuned to that program for at least that predetermined time.

Applicant argues (see Remarks, page 11) that, "There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in Candelore of adding a category to a second set and tuning a broadcast program viewing device for a period at least equal to a first predetermined threshold". Applicant however appears to have misstated what the claim language actually recites. Claim 13 recites, inter alia, "a second unit....configured to add a category from the first set to a second set of categories....in response to selecting the category and tuning the broadcast program viewing device for a period of time at least equal to a first predetermined threshold". The limitation of "tuning" is best understood by the examiner to be in the context of "in response to...tuning a broadcast program viewing device for a period at least equal to a first predetermined threshold" and is consistent with applicant's disclosure [0015]. Candelore discloses maintaining statistics from which favorites are determined, wherein favorite items maybe channels, programs, actors, themes, etc. [0045]. Candelore further discloses maintaining statistics based on the amount of viewing time [0045]. For example if statistics are maintained for a program/category viewed for every 10 minute intervals, a viewer must view the program/category for at least one 10-minute interval for that viewing to be logged as a statistic.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 7 recites "One or tangible computer-readable media", wherein

applicant's disclosure (see, page 14, [0029]) indicates various examples of a,

"computer and/or machine readable media, such as....electrical, optical, acoustical

and other forms of propagated signals (e.g. carrier waves, infrared signals digital

signals, etc.)". Accordingly it is noted that a computer readable can be tangibly be

realized in the form of electrical, optical, acoustical and other forms of propagated

signals. The claim language therefore in its broadest scope encompasses

embodiments of transitory computer readable media, thereby merely reciting signals

per se. Since, a signal is not a process, machine, manufacture or composition of

matter and therefore not a patentable subject matter. See MPEP § 2106.

Claims 8-12 also recite tangible computer readable media, and are non-

statutory for similar reasons. Applicant should amend the claims to include "non-

transitory" to overcome the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with

the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was

not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one

skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed,

had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 21 recites the limitation "wherein the predetermined number of times is

predetermined prior to providing the first set of categories of broadcast programs"

Applicant's disclosure merely discloses that category maybe added based on

number of times a content is selected rather than based on length of time a content

is selected [0015], however is silent on the number of times being predetermined

prior to providing the first set of categories.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 7, 19 and 21, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Candelore et al. (US PG Pub. 2002/0104081) in view of Bedard (US Pat.

5,801,747)

With regards to claims 1 and 7, Candelore discloses a method comprising:

Providing a first set of categories of broadcast programs (EPG, see [0020]);

Providing a second set of categories of broadcast programs (favorites list 408, wherein favorite items maybe channels, programs, actors, themes, etc. [0045]); and

Adding a first category from the first set to the second set of categories of broadcasted programs in response to tuning a broadcast program viewing device to a broadcast program fitting into the first categories a predetermined number of times ([0045]-[0046], list of favorites is based on relative statistics maintained, wherein the relative statistics tracks the number of times a channel, program, actor, director or theme was accessed);

Candelore is silent on wherein the predetermined number of times is greater than 1.

In a related art, Bedard discloses maintaining viewer's favorite programming in a viewer profile array, wherein a profile entry for favorite is created only when a viewing unit for that entry is greater than one (col. 5, lines 7-9). Note that the statistics indicating the number of viewing units of Bedard is analogous to the number of times in the Candelore system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Candelore in view of Bedard by including only items with greater than 1 viewing units (i.e. items accessed more than 1 times) in the favorites list, thereby eliminating insignificant program/category/channel accesses from the favorites list.

With further regards to claim 7, Candelore further discloses one or more computer readable media storing instructions that when executed by a processor cause the processor to perform the above method [0041].

With regards to claim 19, Candelore further discloses wherein the first and second sets are located in a set top box [0019].

With regards to claim 21, the system as modified in view of Bedard further comprises a predetermined (i.e. greater than 1 viewing unit as taught by Bedard) number of times (as taught by Candelore) prior to providing the first set of categories of broadcast programs.

8. Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Candelore et al. (US PG Pub. 2002/0104081) in view of Bedard (US Pat. 5,801,747) as applied to claims 1 and 7, respectively, above, and further in view of Blonstein et al. (US Pat. 5,978,043).

With regards to claims 2, and 8, the modified system is silent on the method further comprising removing a second category from the second set upon selecting the second category from the second set.

In an analogous art, Blonstein discloses a method of allowing user to remove an item from a favorites list upon selecting of the item from the second set (col. 12, lines 23-30). Such a method is facilitated in the event user no longer wants an item to be included in the favorites list.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the system in view of Blonstein's teachings by allowing a viewer to select an

item in the favorites list to remove the item from the favorites list to facilitate removal
of an item user no longer wants to be included in the favorites list.

9. Claims 3-5 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
over Candelore et al. (US PG Pub. 2002/0104081) in view of Bedard (US Pat.
5,801,747) as applied to claims 1 and 7, respectively, above, and further in view of
Rothmuller (US Pat. 5,635,989).

     With regards to claims 3, and 9, the modified system is silent on the method
further comprising removing a second category from the second set upon a
broadcast program viewing device not being tuned, for a period of time at least equal
to a first predetermined threshold, to at least one broadcast program predetermined
to be in the second category from the second set.

     In an analogous art, Rothmuller discloses a method of further tracking when a
program from a favorites list was tuned to (col. 5, lines 62-65, col. 6, lines 26-31).
The system additionally determines that a favorite program has not been tuned to for
a predetermined time period and removes program from the favorites list upon such
a determination (col. 6 lines 48-54). This helps ensure that favorites list is up to date
with user's current favorites rather than older favorites that may no longer be of
interest to the user.

     It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify
the system in view of Rothmuller by further tracking when an item was last accessed
in a favorites list, and removing items that have not been tuned to for a

predetermined threshold thereby purging older entries that are now irrelevant and ensuring that the favorites list is up to date with user's current viewing trends.

With regards to claims 4 and 10, the modified system is silent on the method further comprising, tuning a broadcast program viewing device to a channel on which a broadcast program predetermined to be in a second category from the second set will be broadcasted within a predetermined threshold of current time.

In an analogous art, Rothmuller discloses of alerting or notifying the user about airing of a program item identified as a favorite within a predetermined threshold of current time (col. 7, lines 39-45), and further allowing the user to tune to the program (col. 8, lines 3-15). By notifying the user when items from favorites list is about to air, the system can indicate to the user desirable programs that are about to air in the near future.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art by further modifying the system in view of Rothmuller by notifying the user of desirable programs that are about to air based on user's favorites list and tuning to the program so that the program can be viewed/recorded.

With regards to claims 5 and 11, the modified system is silent on the method further comprising, tuning a broadcast program viewing device, upon a singular pressing of a button, to a channel on which a broadcast program predetermined to be in a second category from the second set will be broadcasted within a predetermined threshold of current time.

In an analogous art, Rothmuller discloses of alerting or notifying the user about airing of a program item identified as a favorite within a predetermined threshold of current time (col. 7, lines 39-45), and further allowing the user to tune to the program (col. 8, lines 3-15) upon a singular press of a button (i.e. AUTO-TUNE key). By notifying the user when items from favorites list is about to air, the system can indicate to the user desirable programs that are about to air in the near future.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art by further modifying the system in view of Rothmuller by notifying the user of desirable programs that are about to air based on user's favorites list and tuning to the program using an auto-tune button so that the program can be viewed/recorded.

10. Claims 6 and 12, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Candelore et al. (US PG Pub. 2002/0104081) in view of Bedard (US Pat. 5,801,747) as applied to claims 1 and 7, respectively, above, and further in view of Ellis et al. (US PG Pub. 2005/0204382) and Schein et al. (US Pat. 6,323,911).

With regards to claim 6, and 12, the modified system is silent on the method further comprising, verifying adding from the first set to the second set including receiving user input confirming the addition of the first category.

In an analogous art, Ellis discloses a method of when a user tunes to a program, presenting a prompt such as "set this program as a favorite?", responsive to which the program is added to favorites [0081].

In a further analogous art, Schein discloses a method of seeking user designation of specific criteria (e.g.) associated with a program a user considers to be a favorite.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system in view of Ellis and Schein's teachings by presenting an on screen prompt to the user asking the user to designate specific criteria for favorites prior to entering it to the favorites list thereby confirming with the viewer the specific criteria/item (e.g. category) of a program to be included in the favorites list.

11. Claims 13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Candelore et al. (US PG Pub. 2002/0104081) in view of Ellis et al. (US PG Pub. 2005/0204382) and Schein et al. (US Pat. 6,323,911).

With regards to claim 13, Candelore discloses a system comprising:

a first unit provide a first set of categories of broadcast programs (EPG 4A 406, see [0020]);

a second unit to provide a second set of categories of broadcast programs (favorites list 408, wherein favorite items maybe channels, programs, actors, themes, etc. [0045]) in response to selecting the category ([0003], [0020]) from the first set and tuning a broadcasted program viewing device, for a period of time at least equal to a first predetermined threshold ("certain period of time" [0045]), to at least one broadcasted program predetermined to be in the category from the first set [0045]-[0046],

      Candelore discloses that various items (including category) pertaining to a program being viewed can be added to the favorites list. Candelore does not disclose the system comprising, wherein the second unit further includes a user verification wherein a user approves the category from the first set being added to the second set prior to the category being added.

      In an analogous art, Ellis discloses a method of when a user tunes to a program, presenting a prompt such as "set this program as a favorite?", responsive to which the program is added to favorites [0081].

      In a further analogous art, Schein discloses a method of seeking user designation of specific criteria (e.g.) associated with a program a user considers to be a favorite (col. 12, lines 15-18).

      It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system in view of Ellis and Schein's teachings by prompting the user to add a program and designated criteria corresponding to the program to the favorites, after a predetermined time of being tuned to that program, so that favorite list adds only items (e.g. user specified criteria on categories) related to the program that are designated by user. When the user to designates a specific criteria corresponding to the program to be included in favorites upon being prompted, the user approves the category from the first list being added to the second set prior to the category being added.

      With regards to claim 20, Candelore further discloses wherein the first and second sets are located in a set top box [0019].

12. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Candelore

et al. (US PG Pub. 2002/0104081) in view of Ellis et al. (US PG Pub. 2005/0204382)

and Schein et al. (US Pat. 6,323,911) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in

view of Blonstein et al. (US Pat. 5,978,043).

With regards to claim 14, the modified system is silent on the method further

comprising removing a second category from the second set upon selecting the

second category from the second set.

In an analogous art, Blonstein discloses a method of allowing user to

remove an item from a favorites list upon selecting of the item from the second set

(col. 12, lines 23-30). Such a method is facilitated in the event user no longer wants

an item to be included in the favorites list.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further

modify the system in view of Blonstein's teachings by allowing a viewer to select an

item in the favorites list to remove the item from the favorites list to facilitate removal

of an item user no longer wants to be included in the favorites list.

13. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Candelore et al. (US PG Pub. 2002/0104081) in view of Ellis et al. (US PG Pub.

2005/0204382) and Schein et al. (US Pat. 6,323,911) as applied to claim 13 above,

and further in view of Rothmuller (US Pat. 5,635,989).

With regards to claim 15, the modified system is silent on the method further

comprising removing a second category from the second set upon a broadcast

program viewing device not being tuned, for a period of time at least equal to a first

predetermined threshold, to at least one broadcast program predetermined to be in the second category from the second set.

In an analogous art, Rothmuller discloses a method of further tracking when a program from a favorites list was tuned to (col. 5, lines 62-65, col. 6, lines 26-31). The system additionally determines that a favorite program has not been tuned to for a predetermined time period and removes program from the favorites list upon such a determination (col. 6 lines 48-54). This helps ensure that favorites list is up to date with user's current favorites rather than older favorites that may no longer be of interest to the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the system in view of Rothmuller by further tracking when an item was last accessed in a favorites list, and removing items that have not been tuned to for a predetermined threshold thereby purging older entries that are now irrelevant and ensuring that the favorites list is up to date with user's current viewing trends.

With regards to claim 16, the modified system is silent on the method further comprising, tuning a broadcast program viewing device to a channel on which a broadcast program predetermined to be in a second category from the second set will be broadcasted within a predetermined threshold of current time.

In an analogous art, Rothmuller discloses of alerting or notifying the user about airing of a program item identified as a favorite within a predetermined threshold of current time (col. 7, lines 39-45), and further allowing the user to tune to the program (col. 8, lines 3-15). By notifying the user when items from favorites list

is about to air, the system can indicate to the user desirable programs that are about

to air in the near future.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art by further

modifying the system in view of Rothmuller by notifying the user of desirable

programs that are about to air based on user's favorites list and tuning to the

program so that the program can be viewed/recorded.

With regards to claim 17, the modified system is silent on the method further

comprising, tuning a broadcast program viewing device, upon a singular pressing of

a button, to a channel on which a broadcast program predetermined to be in a

second category from the second set will be broadcasted within a predetermined

threshold of current time.

In an analogous art, Rothmuller discloses of alerting or notifying the user

about airing of a program item identified as a favorite within a predetermined

threshold of current time (col. 7, lines 39-45), and further allowing the user to tune to

the program (col. 8, lines 3-15) upon a singular press of a button (i.e. AUTO-TUNE

key). By notifying the user when items from favorites list is about to air, the system

can indicate to the user desirable programs that are about to air in the near future.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art by further

modifying the system in view of Rothmuller by notifying the user of desirable

programs that are about to air based on user's favorites list and tuning to the

program using an auto-tune button so that the program can be viewed/recorded.

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

   policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire

   THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is

   filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

   action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

   period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action

   is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from

   the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory

   period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final

   action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

   examiner should be directed to USHA RAMAN whose telephone number is

   (571)272-7380. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 8am-4:30pm.

   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

   examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The

   fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

   assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher Kelley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2424

/Usha Raman/